## REMARKS

The above amendments and these remarks are responsive to the non-final Office Action dated February 6, 2007. By this response, claims 1, 6, 11, 41 and 46 are amended, and claims 5 and 60 are cancelled without prejudice. No new matter is introduced. Claims 1-4, 6-59 are now active for examination.

## The Office Action

The non-final Office Action rejected claims 1-60 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Yaung et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,446,069). The rejection is respectfully overcome in view of the amendments and/or remarks presented herein.

By this Response, claim 1 is amended to incorporate features from claim 5. An exemplary system according to claim 1 interfaces between a plurality of software applications and a plurality of users. In response to an input from one of the users to a particular one of the software applications, the exemplary system provides instructions to the particular software application regarding entitlements of the one of the plurality of users to access a particular function of the particular software application. For each software application, an identification of hierarchically arranged functions associated with that software application is provided. An entitlement of the one of the plurality of users to one of the hierarchically arranged functions automatically applies to functions that are hierarchically subordinate to the one of the plurality of hierarchically arranged functions.

Thus, if the authorization for a function is changed from "enabled" to "read-only," then all child sub-functions (and sub-sub-functions) inherit the new "read-only" setting. Also, if a function is set to expire for a particular client (e.g. client 112) at a particular time, then that

function expires for all job-roles of that client 112 that previously had access to the function. See e.g. page 12, fourth paragraph of the application.

On the other hand, technology disclosed in Yaung is quite different. Yaung's system utilizes a privilege vector (DV) to define a user's privilege in accessing functions related to a digital library (e.g. Col. 9, ln. 1 through col. 10, ln. 15 of Yaung). However, Yaung does not specifically teach that (1) functions of an application should be arranged in a hierarchical manner, such as functions and sub-functions, and (2) an entitlement of a user to one of the hierarchically arranged functions <u>automatically applies to functions that are hierarchically subordinate to that function.</u>

As Yaung fails to meet every limitation of claim 1, Yaung cannot support a prima facie case of anticipation. Accordingly, the anticipation rejection of claim is overcome. Favorable reconsideration of claim 1 is respectfully solicited.

Claims 1-4 and 6-59, directly or indirectly, depend on claim 1 and incorporate every limitation thereof. Consequently, claims 1-4 and 6-59 are patentable over Yaung by virtue of their dependencies.

Claim 41, as amended, describes a computer readable medium bearing instructions for providing application-level security. Under the control of the instructions, in response to an input from one of the users to a particular one of the software applications, instructions are provided to the particular software application regarding entitlements of the one of the plurality of users to access a particular function of the particular software application. For each software application, an identification of hierarchically arranged functions associated with that software application is provided. <u>An entitlement of the one of the plurality of users to one of the hierarchically arranged functions automatically applies to functions that are hierarchically subordinate to the one of the</u>

plurality of hierarchically arranged functions.

As discussed earlier relative to claim 1, Yaung fails to disclose these features. Accordingly, Claim 41 is also patentable over Yaung for at least the same reasons as for claim 1.

For the reasons given above, Applicants believe that this application is in condition for allowance, and Applicants request that the Examiner give the application favorable reconsideration and permit it to issue as a patent. However, if the Examiner believes that the application can be put in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

Wei-Chen Nicholas Chen
Registration No. 56,665

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: July 31, 2007
WDC99 1358190-2.067389.0023

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277 as our correspondence address.**